

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>LEROY A. THOMAS,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:05-CV-2689</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>WARDEN HOGSTEN,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 1st day of March, 2006, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 14) of the order of court dated February 17, 2006 (Doc. 12), striking the specific request for \$95,000 in damages, and it appearing that the prior order of court struck only the *amount* requested, not defendant's *request* for damages, see L.R. 8.1 ("The demand for judgment . . . shall not claim any specific sum where unliquidated damages are involved."), and that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the order of court, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence."), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 14) is DENIED.

/s/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge